

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 93 11:59:13 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #133
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 29 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 133

Today's Topics:

 AH1A 40 meter op times?
 FG/DF5WA/P QTH?
 FM broadcast station sidebands
 New Products
 No Codes
 ORBS\$030.2liners
 radio nuts vs Lan times
 Real Extras (was Real NoCodes)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 29 Jan 93 16:15:03 GMT
From: noao!asuvax!gatech!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!swrinde!@arizona.edu
Subject: AH1A 40 meter op times?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I've been trying to find AH1A on 40 meters but so far no luck hearing them.
It's not propagation problems 'cause they boom into Oregon on all the other
bands.

I'm aware of the operating frequencies, but does anyone know what times
stateside is being worked?

Thanks,
Steve/AA7FL
milewski@oregon.uoregon.edu

Date: 29 Jan 1993 16:17:57 GMT
From: gatech!rpi!usenet.coe.montana.edu!news.uoregon.edu!fp2-st-
affairs-17.uoregon.edu!user@uunet.uu.net
Subject: FG/DF5WA/P QTH?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

This station was very active a few days ago on 80 meters. I didn't want to screw up his rhythm working the pileup by asking questions...but he never did say what his QTH was?

Is the "/P" operation a new IOTA in the Guadeloupe chain? Thanks for any clues.

Steve/AA7FL
milewski@oregon.uoregon.edu

Date: 28 Jan 93 19:33:12 GMT
From: olivea!mintaka.lcs.mit.edu!micro-heart-of-gold.mit.edu!xn.ll.mit.edu!
ll.mit.edu!wjc@ames.arpa
Subject: FM broadcast station sidebands
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Some details of FM Multiplex broadcasting are being jumbled in this thread.

First, a station transmitting stereo uses double-sideband, suppressed-carrier modulation to put the Left-Right signal onto a *38-kHz* subcarrier. The pilot tone is sent at *19 kHz*. The Left+Right signal remains at baseband. These three components are summed and fed into the FM transmitter. The pilot is used to identify the transmission as stereo and to generate a 38-kHz reference for the Left-Right synchronous (DSB-SC) detector in the receiver.

Second, SCA stands for "Subsidiary Communication Authorization" --- i.e. the station is allowed to transmit additional information besides the main monophonic or stereophonic program. An SCA signal is sent by having the signal frequency-modulate or frequency-shift-key yet another subcarrier which is summed into the FM transmitter's input.

Two traditional SCA subcarrier frequencies are 41 kHz and 67 kHz. The 41-kHz subcarrier cannot be used if the station is transmitting a stereophonic main program. Stations are now also using subcarriers at 50-something and 90-something kHz (I think 53 and 92, I can check if

anyone's interested). In general, a station can use more than one SCA subcarrier at a time. Again, if the interest is there, I can post more details on the technical standards.

Typical SCA signals are background music, readings for the blind, stock-market quotations, and paging sequences. The latter two are sent in serial digital form.

Usually SCA signals are not considered free broadcasts; the originator of the signal expects you to pay for its reception. This is why consumer FM receivers (in my experience) do not include SCA decoders.

73

Bill Chiarchiaro N1CPK
wjc@ll.mit.edu

Date: 28 Jan 93 14:51:17 CST
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!The-
Star.honeywell.com!umn.edu!mmm.serc.3m.com!mmc.mmmg.com!timbuk.cray.com!
walter.cray.com@saimiri.prima.te.wisc.edu
Subject: New Products
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C1JF08.EnI@amdcl2>, brian@amdcl2.amd.com (Brian McMinn, N5PSS) writes:
|> In the Feb 93 QST, I saw the following new products that looked
|> interesting...
|>
|> j-Com MX series
|>
|> HT's for 80m through 6m! (CW and SSB only) weight: 20oz incl.
|> batteries. 2 Watts, single band \$350

This sure looks a lot like the old AEA DX-Handi... Aren't they made by 'Mitzui' (sp.)? Surplus Sales had a closeout on these a year or two ago for about \$150, but I didn't get one. AEA only carried the 6 and 10 meter version.

Has anyone actually used this box? The thing looks so cheezy it's kind of cute! (Tin box with slits cut out for speaker/mike - no nice keypad or LCD display.) I heard a guy on 10 meters a couple of years ago who had one. He was trying to get a WAS with it!

I'll bet the rubber duck works great on 80. :-)

Walt

Walt Spector

(www@renaissance.cray.com)

Sunnyvale, California

..- ..- -.. -..-

Date: 29 Jan 93 18:47:11 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu

Subject: No Codes

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

How about:

"An operator holding a Technician class license has all privileges(sp) in all bands above 50MHz. A Technician class operator who has passed Element 1A also has all of the privileges(again?) of a Novice class operator."

73

Alan Cook N7CEU@WF60.#SOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM

AVCOOK@ananov.remnet.ab.com

----- -:!:- -----

Alan V. Cook

Internet: AVCOOK@ananov.remnet.ab.com

Rockwell International

Ham Packet: N7CEU @ WF60

(714) 762-0843

DoD: #0701

Alternate Internet: Cookav@catipult.anatcp.rockwell.com

Date: 29 Jan 93 17:33:31 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu

Subject: ORBS\$030.2liners

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SB KEPS @ AMSAT \$ORBS-030.N

2Line Orbital Elements 030.AMSAT

HR AMSAT ORBITAL ELEMENTS FOR AMATEUR SATELLITES IN NASA FORMAT

FROM N3FKV HEWITT, TX January 30, 1993 BID:\$ORBS-030.N

DECODE 2-LINE ELSETS WITH THE FOLLOWING KEY:

1 AAAAAU 00 0 0 BBBB.BBBBBBBB .CCCCCCC 00000-0 00000-0 0 DDDZ
2 AAAAA EEE.EEEE FFF.FFFF GGGGGGG HHH.HHHH III.IIII JJ.JJJJJJJKKKKKZ
KEY: A-CATALOGNUM B-EPOCHTIME C-DECAY D-ELSETNUM E-INCLINATION F-RAAN
G-ECCENTRICITY H-ARGPERIGEE I-MNANOM J-MNMOTION K-ORBITNUM Z-CHECKSUM

TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS BT

AO-10

1 14129U 83 58 B 93026.32427282 -.00000049 00000-0 99998-4 0 9612
2 14129 27.0246 42.8384 6022021 52.3966 348.5895 2.05878580 72344

UO-11

1 14781U 84 21 B 93026.61330566 .000000546 00000-0 97390-4 0 3964
2 14781 97.8258 59.1865 0013273 88.3358 271.9366 14.68839657475936

RS-10/11

1 18129U 87 54 A 93028.31353610 .000000097 00000-0 99999-4 0 5383
2 18129 82.9260 341.9945 0012253 353.0964 7.0018 13.72307113280664

AO-13

1 19216U 88 51 B 93027.82104774 -.000000175 00000-0 99999-4 0 5602
2 19216 57.4307 335.9809 7314574 306.0019 6.5580 2.09724338 35419

FO-20

1 20480U 90 13 C 93020.19160350 .000000010 00000-0 52904-4 0 4367
2 20480 99.0607 264.2542 0541500 61.8638 303.6090 12.83216534138333

AO-21

1 21087U 91 6 A 93025.88184923 .000000101 00000-0 99999-4 0 6837
2 21087 82.9429 158.1338 0036791 58.3844 302.0884 13.74507886 99890

RS-12/13

1 21089U 91 7 A 93011.55744800 .000000039 00000-0 34790-4 0 3908
2 21089 82.9220 38.2731 0030134 118.2489 242.1744 13.74011781 97017

UO-14

1 20437U 90 5 B 93026.22016039 .000000148 00000-0 65440-4 0 7144
2 20437 98.6268 112.0328 0010588 240.1178 119.8952 14.29729593157143

AO-16

1 20439U 90 5 D 93027.69579257 .000000116 00000-0 53009-4 0 5426
2 20439 98.6319 114.2555 0010471 236.1106 123.9088 14.29789670157367

DO-17

1 20440U 90 5 E 93025.24935489 .000000160 00000-0 69723-4 0 5441
2 20440 98.6317 112.0023 0010893 245.6645 114.3400 14.29921748157023

WO-18

1 20441U 90 5 F 93026.19666309 .000000144 00000-0 63956-4 0 5465
2 20441 98.6316 112.9760 0011363 242.6622 117.3403 14.29906618157165

LO-19

1 20442U 90 5 G 93027.74668344 .000000132 00000-0 59232-4 0 5435
2 20442 98.6329 114.6644 0011788 237.9593 122.0447 14.29993852157397

UO-22

1 21575U 91 50 B 93021.72455528 .000000204 00000-0 76046-4 0 2411
2 21575 98.4886 100.1074 0008391 19.7776 340.3734 14.36767856 79638

KO-23

1 22077U 92 52 B 93006.08586143 -.000000000 00000-0 99999-4 0 866

2 22077 66.0809 303.5860 0013347 229.3565 130.6278 12.86275910 18999
 NOAA-9
 1 15427U 84123 A 93028.06434252 .000000096 00000-0 61462-4 0 2828
 2 15427 99.1205 65.7086 0014524 201.0116 159.0486 14.13478024418983
 NOAA-10
 1 16969U 86 73 A 93028.03913042 .000000116 00000-0 57772-4 0 1306
 2 16969 98.5219 47.1623 0013649 9.1457 350.9956 14.24758221330671
 MET-2/17
 1 18820U 88 5 A 93021.21307832 .000000070 00000-0 57263-4 0 8499
 2 18820 82.5420 315.8183 0015551 177.2153 182.9098 13.84669459251509
 MET-3/2
 1 19336U 88 64 A 93017.91798145 .000000043 00000-0 99999-4 0 179
 2 19336 82.5511 328.2883 0018112 107.3503 252.9638 13.16954563215435
 NOAA-11
 1 19531U 88 89 A 93027.87909838 .000000233 00000-0 14608-3 0 367
 2 19531 99.1143 1.0292 0012511 110.7312 249.5198 14.12817137223861
 MET-2/18
 1 19851U 89 18 A 93011.52641567 .000000065 00000-0 52312-4 0 7929
 2 19851 82.5195 199.8019 0013411 251.5302 108.4399 13.84316424195512
 MET-3/3
 1 20305U 89 86 A 93024.57671910 .000000043 00000-0 99999-4 0 6943
 2 20305 82.5520 266.1827 0016846 110.0826 250.2083 13.16008522156212
 MET-2/19
 1 20670U 90 57 A 93020.65406890 .000000057 00000-0 46138-4 0 5420
 2 20670 82.5461 255.5572 0016355 141.9113 218.3205 13.84158111129718
 FY-1/2
 1 20788U 90 81 A 93027.95495254 .000000028 00000-0 29959-4 0 5081
 2 20788 98.8770 58.2465 0013722 342.3014 17.7666 14.01272437122940
 MET-2/20
 1 20826U 90 86 A 93011.53490329 .000000069 00000-0 56814-4 0 5427
 2 20826 82.5248 201.0042 0014360 69.2765 290.9929 13.83529972115621
 MET-3/4
 1 21232U 91 30 A 93010.99276195 .000000044 00000-0 99999-4 0 3445
 2 21232 82.5434 178.8808 0018695 62.6945 297.6078 13.16815399 82633
 NOAA-12
 1 21263U 91 32 A 93028.09723891 .000000191 00000-0 10370-3 0 4888
 2 21263 98.6721 60.6018 0012136 260.4750 99.5051 14.22191169 88738
 MET-3/5
 1 21655U 91 56 A 93015.47888673 .000000043 00000-0 99999-4 0 3922
 2 21655 82.5542 122.3715 0014527 52.8262 307.4185 13.16813951 68327
 MIR
 1 16609U 86017 A 93028.67205904 .00010769 00000-0 13905-3 0 08431
 2 16609 051.6222 200.0290 0002381 311.5235 048.6223 15.58302108397376
 HUBBLE
 1 20580U 90 37 B 93026.05659424 .00001233 00000-0 10334-3 0 184
 2 20580 28.4689 259.9730 0004499 355.9649 4.0878 14.92273950150269
 GRO
 1 21225U 91 27 B 93028.67622458 .00024113 00000-0 20997-3 0 8005

2 21225 28.4732 230.7427 0006683 340.5706 19.4632 15.67425206103280
SARA
1 21578U 91 50 E 93012.75892105 .00000879 00000-0 30368-3 0 3980
2 21578 98.4930 92.0097 0005632 55.9525 304.2195 14.38178459 78382
UARS
1 21701U 91 63 B 93019.26540755 -.00000453 00000-0 -28981-4 0 2388
2 21701 56.9836 58.3952 0004452 75.0880 285.0579 14.96563693 74004
FREJA
1 22161U 92 64 A 92365.58631514 .00000284 00000-0 18456-3 0 971
2 22161 63.0059 201.9500 0769497 267.8411 83.4390 13.21543263 11273
/EX

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 93 17:55:29 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!netsys!agate!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-
state.edu!mstar!n8emr!gws@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: radio nuts vs Lan times
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Lan times has an article titled "Wireless option cures LAN Barrier"
in their Jan 25, 1993 issue. The talk about using wireless lan.
The articles remarks about "one ham radio nut" suggesting
that a LAN wireless link could be bounced off another build.

--
Gary W. Sanders gws@n8emr.cmhnet.org, 72277,1325
N8EMR @ N8JYV (ip addr) 44.70.0.1 [Ohio AMPR address coordinator]
HAM BBS 614-895-2553 (1200/2400/V.32/PEP) Voice: 614-895-2552 (eves/weekends)

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 20:27:39 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpl-opus!
hpnmdla!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Real Extras (was Real NoCodes)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, hdavies@rx.xerox.com (Hugh J.E. Davies) writes:

>It seems that radio amateurs are not only divided by their knowledge
>of Morse Code.

>They are also divided by their possession (or not) of a sense of humour.

So it would seem. In reality, out of the thousands of hams reading this
notes group only a handful became irate and profane. Unfortunately
the "silent majority" are not the ones heard.

AL N1AL

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1993 22:27:43 GMT
From: saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
paladin.american.edu!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C1F8Fp.4wM@inews.Intel.COM>, <44051@zygot.ati.com>,
<C1KBL8.HrC@acsu.buffalo.edu>n.an
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Ham Radio Causes Cancer

In article <C1KBL8.HrC@acsu.buffalo.edu> oopdavid@ubvmsb.cc.buffalo.edu (D.RODMAN)
writes:

[Note, attribution lines have become somewhat confused]
>In article <44051@zygot.ati.com>, john@zygot.ati.com (John Higdon) writes...
>>In article <C1F8Fp.4wM@inews.Intel.COM> jreece@sousa.intel.com writes:
>>
>>>There have been a number of "reports" on the major TV news magazines and
>>>tabloid shows about electromagnetic fields in general, and RF in particular,
>>>causing cancer.
>
>Your comment is typical of an uninformed (and likely uneducated) bias
>about this subject. It is my contention that epidemiological studies
>to date, often quoted in the media, mention a link between exposure to
>electromagnetic fields and various cancers. Basic research has evaluated
>the mechanisms whereby such fields "promote" cancer. This is a topic
>that should be considered by all as an important one, not apparently
>something to ignore. Would you say that smoking does not cause cancer
>because you never saw anyone die under laboratory conditions and ruled
>out all other causes? Get real. There is more to life and biological
>systems than even the most learned in our scientific community can
>explain.
[deleted]
>>>RF tissue heating is mentioned in the various ARRL license manuals.
>>
>>This is about all we know about RF and its effects upon living tissues.
>
>This statement sounds like an "Adairism" if I have ever heard one. You
>are WRONG, my friend.

David, your uncritical acceptance of media pseudoscience is touching.
However, correlation is not causation, and even the evidence for
correlation for non-thermal effects of UHF RF in this case is non-existent,

and the correlation found in an epidemiological study of amateurs using RF of unquantified frequency and intensity, with no controls for frequency or intensity of exposure, or for other occupational or lifestyle factors, are hardly above the statistical noise for the small samples studied *if the correlation exists at all*. Monte Carlo simulations show similar false correlations more than half the time.

Some very interesting *science* has been done studying the possible effects of ELF energy on the electrochemistry of living systems, but there is no data to show that these effects also occur at UHF. The mechanisms discovered don't support it. The fields at UHF reverse much too quickly for the ions propagating across membranes to respond.

As John says, we don't know of any non-thermal biological effects of UHF RF. They *may* exist, but there are no epidemiological studies that show strong correlations, nor is there any scientific evidence of a mechanism by which causation may occur. We shouldn't forget how media science condemned cyclamates based on mere correlation only later to discover that the correlations were flawed and the mechanisms were dependent on dosages beyond all possibility of actually occurring in practice. Even the EPA has had to backpedal with respect to their initial condemnation of dioxins, and the whole field of low level radiation exposure is rife with controversy.

What we do *know* is that thermal effects at high power densities are real, so we should avoid them. What we also *know* is that any secondary effects are smaller than other risk factors we face daily, otherwise amateurs would all be dead from cancer already. Since we obviously are not, and amateurs as a group are elderly with long exposure histories, we can with confidence state that any possible non-thermal risks are small.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 29 Jan 93 16:15:15 GMT
From: noao!asuvax!gatech!udel!bogus.sura.net!@arizona.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <44051@zygot.ati.com>, <C1KBL8.HrC@acsu.buffalo.edu>,
<1993Jan28.222743.5974@ke4zv.uucp>ech
Subject : Re: Ham Radio Causes Cancer

In article <1993Jan28.222743.5974@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman),
comments on the growing :) discussion on rf exposure and cancer:

>However, correlation is not causation, and even the evidence for
>correlation for non-thermal effects of UHF RF in this case is non-existent,
>and the correlation found in an epidemiological study of amateurs using RF
>of unquantified frequency and intensity, with no controls for frequency or
>intensity of exposure, or for other occupational or lifestyle factors, are
>hardly above the statistical noise for the small samples studied *if the
>correlation exists at all*. Monte Carlo simulations show similar false
>correlations more than half the time.

>

> rest of Gary's comments deleted for brevity...

Indeed, regressions offer evidence of correlation NOT causation. Consider
the following alternate hypothesis:

Hams (Real Hams if you would like) are more likely to have a
technical vocation when compared to a general person off the street.
Hence they are more likely to be exposed to flux fumes, benzene vapors,
chlorinated hydrocarbon cleaners, x-rays etc. (I get exposed to chalk
dust and vapors from dry-erase, a misnomer believe me, marker fumes) :)
As a consequence they have a higher incidence of cancer. Since technical
people are attracted to a technical hobby, you would pick up a spurious
correlation. The correlation would be like:

People in doctor's offices have a higher incidence of sickness than
the general population. Ergo: visiting a doctor causes sickness.

NOT

Rajiv

aa9ch

Address: r-dewan@nwu.edu

Phone: None. Only CW.

Date: Fri, 29 Jan 1993 16:27:18 GMT

From: gatech!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-
state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!rdewan@uunet.uu.net

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan27.090717.2148@guvax.acc.georgetown.edu>,

<1993Jan28.211130.16685@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <C1Lp3D.6v8@ms.uky.edu>s.

Subject : Re: My call sign : (

In article <C1Lp3D.6v8@ms.uky.edu> miles@ms.uky.edu (Stephen D. Grant) writes:
>yanagi@32799.enet.dec.com (32799::yanagi) writes:

>
>> My wife passed her test on 10/20/92 and got her license 1/2/93, so
>> mid-February would be a reasonable guess.
>> Good luck (and hang in there - I've been through your desperation!)
>> John N2KJM
>
> Whaaaa! This sucks! I've had my DJ580 for weeks and weeks and no license yet!
>I've not experienced the pleasure of "trasmission" (except for those occasional
>(purely accidental, mind you) blips on the PTT button that trigger the oh-so-
>sweet sounding repeater ID. ;). I took my test 12.2 I believe. Nothing yet. :(
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Yes. CW is sweet isn't it. CU on the cw bands.

Rajiv
aa9ch
Address: r-dewan@nwu.edu
Phone: None. Only CW.

Date: 28 Jan 93 23:53:08 GMT
From: olivea!sgigate!odin!jerber.sandiego.sgi.com!jerryb@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <N1-ls*8y0@lemsys.UUCP>, <1993Jan26.104432.1@kean.ucs.mun.ca>,
<1993Jan26.181953.25999@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>
Subject : Re: Real NoCodes_, Enough is enough!

Isn't it about time the subject of 'Code VS No-Code be allowed to die a natural death?

What's the point of arguing the merits or lack of merits for CW or No-Code. No-Code is here to stay, and legal(I'm not a big fan of No-Code)! It's not going to go away by complaining about it. FCC/Washington DC says so! Relax and ACCEPT the fact that it's here to stay. If you can't accept it, there's not a lot (constructive things, anyway) you can do about it!

I'm not a heavy CW type, but enjoy it occasionally, as I would a comfortable old chair. It's low-tech, needs no exotic equipment, and is a skill that once learned really is fun to use. It's like an old Model T car. Sure it's outdated, but it's still fun to drive. And the argument that CW is NOT outdated is correct, too! Personal points of view are legal, remember?

And for you Anti-CW types, why bitch about a mode you aren't going to use.

If you don't see it's purpose, then don't complain about it's useage, because there are others who can and do see CW's purpose. If you have trouble agreeing that their purpose is valid, well, that's just life. No one ever said we all have to agree with you (or me!).

I personally liked the CW requirement to keep the 'ham club' somewhat exclusive. For many years, I knew enough to pass the written general class exams, but the CW requirement was something I hadn't worked at hard enough to pass. It took a while, but I finally did get to work and finally passed the CW requirement. It was tough, but it was rewarding and a real feeling of accomplishment. It's well known many people are/were in that same predicament, not wanting to take the trouble (and it is a fair bit of effort) to learn morse code well enough to pass the 5 WPM or even 13 WPM requirements. I personally think if you want to get into a hobby/trade/profession badly enough, you do have to be prepared to work for it.

Since you no longer have to learn CW to get a Technician license, it does seem to be too easy to get a ham license. You don't have to 'pay your dues' by learning CW as most did. And it's understandable having the bad feelings about 'Well I had to learn it, and I don't like that others can now be a ham and not have to go through the endless hours of learning the 'dits' and 'dahs' like I did, it's just too easy, now'.

The point is, No-Code is here to stay, like it or not. Don't waste the energy by flaming each other continuously, the No-Code types VS Code types.

What I cannot accept is the constant bickering on this BB regarding CW. What's the point? Knock it off!! What can one hope to accomplish by bitching about the no-codes, or bitching about the CW types belonging to an extinct age (not true).

Some EXTREME no-code proponents sound as though they would BAN CW if they could, because of it's less efficient spectrum usage. That's the argument they use, at least. If they had their way, many no-code types would like to ban CW and demand all hams go to the more efficient (uses of radio spectrum) emissions such as that used by packet. Those are very often computer 'geeks' who honestly have trouble communicating with other humans except via keyboard. They have no conception of the earlier 'romance' of the various non-digital (I.E. read AM, SSB, CW) modes.

They would, if they could, ban the 'non-efficient' modes they don't like. And many people don't like what they don't understand, couldn't master, no interest in, or whatever (I.E., CW).

Ham radio, if you didn't know, is a huge assortment of old and new technologies, including digital (packet, etc.). Those modes are what make

it a very rich and rewarding hobby....enough modes to always keep you learning if you want.

If you aren't into CW, what is your REAL purpose in bashing it. What is the harm of people doing CW, or even AM? None! It's all part of the rich spectrum of activities. So what if it takes more spectrum? Rarely, except in the case of contest times, is the total ham band fully in use. We have spectrum to use, we need to use it to keep from losing it. I suspect those who say CW is inefficient and should be banned are the same types that would ban the driving of old classic cars and airplanes because they can't pass the smog test! They don't understand, they just don't understand. Intolerant, too!

And for the people bashing No-Coders, (I would probably have voted to keep the CW requirement, to be honest), lighten up and forget it. What's the use of bashing them. It's OK to not like the fact that No-Code was passed, but what does it accomplish to keep complaining now that No-Code is here? Not a bit of good! It certainly doesn't help the cohesiveness of amateur radio. It only divides ham radio against itself!

It certainly doesn't help ham radio to be bickering among ourselves, this is supposed to be like a fraternity of people with similar interests (technology, radios, communications, friendship!)

How about accepting No-Coders, CW, SSB, AM, RTTY, Packet, X.25, FM, etc., etc., and getting on with our amateur radio lives. After all, a person can get an ulcer by worrying about something he doesn't have a lot of control over!

73,
Jerry, KC6TAY (Tech+)
(These are my opinions, not those of my company!!!)

Keywords:

--
~~~~~  
Jerry Bransford  
Silicon Graphics  
(619) 546-0409  
~~~~~  

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #133
